

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are now pending in the application. Claims 17 and 24 are amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Komeno (U.S. Pat. No. 6,912,036). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 has been amended and rewritten. Claim 17 now recites an electro-optical device comprising a pair of opposed substrates. An electro-optical material is interposed between the pair of opposed substrates. A metal film formed of a metal material having a vertical side rising in a substantially vertical direction away from one of the opposed substrates is also recited. Claim 17 also recites an insulating film having a first portion covering the metal film and a second portion disposed adjacent to the vertical side of the metal film. The second portion of the insulating film is thinner than the metal film so that the vertical side of the metal film is exposed through the insulating film. Lastly, Claim 17 recites a wiring line disposed on the insulating film and electrically connected to the vertical side of the metal film that is exposed through the insulating film.

Claim 24 has also been amended and rewritten. Claim 24 now recites an electrical wiring structure comprising a substrate and a wiring pattern. A wiring pattern includes a first region and a second region. The first region includes a structure in which an insulating film is formed on the substrate and a conductive film formed of a

transparent conductive film is formed on the insulating film. The second region includes a structure in which a metal film formed of a metal material is formed on the substrate, the insulating film is formed on the metal film, and the conductive film is formed on the insulating film. Lastly, Claim 24 recites that the metal film has a vertical side rising in a substantial vertical direction away from the substrate a boundary between the first region and the second region. The insulating film in the first region is formed to have a thickness that is less than a thickness of the metal film in the second region, and the vertical side of the metal film is exposed from the insulating film formed in the first region and the second region such that the conductive film extends from the first region and contacts the vertical side at the boundary between the first region and the second region. The metal film formed in the second region is electrically connected through the conductive film making contact with the vertical side. This subject matter is not anticipated by Komeno.

More specifically, referring to Figure 16 of Komeno, it can be seen that the conductive film ITO is covered by the insulating film TAS. This is in contrast to the claimed invention. That is, the claimed invention recites that the wiring line covers the insulating film. Because the insulating film covers the wiring line in Komeno, the opposite structure than the claimed invention is disclosed by Komeno.

What's more, because Komeno teaches that the passivation layer PAS is formed over the source/drain SD2, it should be understood that if this order was to have a similar structure similar to the claimed structure, (i.e., reversed so that the source/drain SD2 was formed over the passivation layer PAS), then electric contact between the source/drain SD2 and the semiconductor layer SI would be obstructed and the thin

transistor would not function. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 17 and 24 and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komeno (U.S. Pat. No. 6,912,036). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20 and 23 are dependent on Claim 17, addressed above. Claims 20 and 23 would not have been obvious for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 1-16, 18-19, and 21-22 are allowed. Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the allowance of these claims. Notwithstanding, reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e).

In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the

reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes that claims 1-16, 19-19, and 21-22 are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 29, 2006

By:

G. Gregory Schwley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH